

REMARKS

Claims 4, 11, 14, and 20-28 are cancelled; claims 29-40 are new; thus, claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-13, 15-19, and 29-40 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 10 and 12-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 1-10 and 12-28 stand rejected on prior art grounds. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

I. The 35 U.S.C. §101 Rejection

Claims 10 and 12-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 10 to each define graphically displaying said categories of semantic orientation”. As such, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 10, and their respective dependent claims, define the useful, concrete, and tangible result of displaying the categories. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

II. The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-10 and 12-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Subasic, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,721,734), hereinafter referred to as Subasic. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

The claimed invention provides a method wherein opinions about a topic are extracted from a corpus of text documents. Opinions are extracted based on rules defining regular expressions for parts-of-speech tags. Opinions are grouped based on their semantic orientation as favourable, unfavourable or neutral. A balanced and accurate assessment of sentiment towards a topic can thus be determined.

In the rejection, the Office Action argues that Subasic discloses many features of the claimed invention. However, nothing within Subasic discloses extracting opinions from a document. Instead, Subasic only discloses computing an emotional profile of a document. Therefore, as explained in greater detail below, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Applicants traverse the rejections because the prior art of record fails to disclose the claimed features of “extracting regular expressions from said document by matching at least one regular expression rule with said parts of speech tag sequences, wherein said regular expression rule comprises said regularly occurring patterns”. Such features are defined in independent claims 1, 10, and 33 using identical language.

More specifically, as described in paragraph 0023 of Applicants’ disclosure, opinion extraction is based on the observation that POS tag sequences of opinions follow a regular pattern. Certain tag sequence patterns occur regularly in the POS tag sequences of opinions. A set of regular expression rules of POS tags that covers the frequently occurring patterns is constructed. Regular expression is any description of a pattern composed from combinations of symbols (POS tags in this case) and the three operators are Concatenation, Or and Closure.

As further described in paragraph 0024 of Applicants' disclosure, these regular expressions are matched against the POS tag sequences of the words in the documents. For every maximal match of the POS tag sequence, the corresponding words are extracted from the original document and reported as opinions. The input to this stage is the POS tagged document and the regular expression (RE) rules that depicts the possible opinions. The system then matches the RE rules with POS tag sequence patterns in the input text document and outputs the opinions.

To the contrary, nothing within Subasic discloses extracting opinions from a documents. Instead, Subasic only discloses computing an emotional profile of a document. Therefore, it is Applicants position that the prior art of record fails to teach the claimed features of "extracting regular expressions from said document by matching at least one regular expression rule with said parts of speech tag sequences, wherein said regular expression rule comprises said regularly occurring patterns" as defined in independent claims 1, 10, and 33.

Therefore, it is Applicants' position that the prior art of record do not teach or suggest many features defined by independent claims 1, 10, 33 and that such claims are patentable over the prior art of record. Further, it is Applicants' position that dependent claims 2-3, 5-9, 12-13, 15-19, 29-32, and 34-40 are similarly patentable, not only because of their dependency from a patentable independent claims, but also because of the additional features of the invention they defined. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

II. Formal Matters and Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-13, 15-19, and 29-40, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary. Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney's Deposit Account Number 09-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 23, 2007

/Duane N. Moore/
Duane N. Moore
Registration No. 53,352

Gibb & Rahman, LLC
2568-A Riva Road, Suite 304
Annapolis, MD 21401
Voice: (410) 573-6501
Fax: (301) 261-8825
Customer Number: 29154